

ORDER OF BUSINESS

(Mr. SOLOMON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to make an announcement regarding the remainder of the session this evening.

Mr. Speaker, we are about to take up the rule that will make in order the budget for 1999 and two substitutes that go with it. That will be debated fully this evening. There may or may not be a vote on that rule. Then we would go into 3 hours of general debate, and there would be no further votes in the House this evening when that takes place.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SOLOMON. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I assure the gentleman there will be a vote on the rule tonight.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I am glad we got that cleared up. So it is 9:25, and we can expect a vote around 10:25, and then bid you all good night. The rest of us will stay here and debate the very important bill.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. CON. RES. 284, CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 1999

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 455 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 455

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 1(b) of rule XXIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 284) revising the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 1998, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 1999, and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2000, 2001, 2002, and 2003. The first reading of the concurrent resolution shall be dispensed with. General debate shall not exceed three hours, with two hours of general debate confined to the congressional budget equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget, and one hour of general debate on the subject of economic goals and policies equally divided and controlled by Representative Saxton of New Jersey and Representative Stark of California or their designees. After general debate the concurrent resolution shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider as an original concurrent resolution for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in part 1 of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All

points of order against that amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in part 2 of the report of the Committee on Rules. Each amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and shall not be subject to amendment. All points of order against the amendments printed in the report are waived except that the adoption of an amendment in the nature of a substitute shall constitute the conclusion of consideration of the concurrent resolution for amendment. The chairman of the Committee of the Whole may: (1) postpone until a time during further consideration in the Committee of the Whole a request for a recorded vote on any amendment; and (2) reduce to five minutes the minimum time for electronic voting on any postponed question that follows another electronic vote without intervening business, provided that the minimum time for electronic voting on the first in any series of questions shall be 15 minutes. At the conclusion of consideration of the concurrent resolution for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the concurrent resolution to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole to the concurrent resolution or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the concurrent resolution and amendments thereto to final adoption without intervening motion except amendments offered by the chairman of the Committee on the Budget pursuant to section 305(a)(5) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to achieve mathematical consistency. The concurrent resolution shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question of its adoption.

SEC. 2. Rule XLIX shall not apply with respect to the adoption by the Congress of a concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1999.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York (Mr. SOLOMON) is recognized for 1 hour.

(Mr. SOLOMON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, for the purposes of debate only, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded, of course, is for debate purposes only.

Mr. Speaker, I am not going to bother to repeat and explain the rule itself, because the House Clerk has done a very good job with it.

I would say, Mr. Speaker, last February the President of the United States submitted a budget to Congress that was a relic of the tax-and-spend policies of Democrats of the past. Just 6 months after this Republican Congress and President Clinton enacted into law the first balanced budget in a generation and the first tax cut in 16 years, President Clinton sent us a backward-looking budget. It was just the opposite of what we had been doing.

□ 2130

That budget, ladies and gentlemen, called for 85 new spending programs, 85 new entitlement programs. It created 39 new entitlement programs. It increased spending by \$150 billion, again, going just the opposite direction of what we have been moving to, and it increased taxes and user fees by \$129 billion, ladies and gentlemen.

Mr. Speaker, in this Republican-controlled House, that approach to budgeting and governing is a nonstarter. We can thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH) sitting over here, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget, for what I would call unbelievable due diligence of bringing this budget which is not draconian. As a matter of fact, I think if he and I had our total way and we were to dictate the terms of this budget, we would see some further major, major cuts in this bill.

But today the House has the opportunity to move this Nation in a new direction and, I would argue, in the right direction with the passage of the Kasich budget. The Kasich budget establishes an honest blueprint for this Congress to achieve four important goals.

Those four important goals are, Mr. Speaker: paying down our \$5.5 trillion debt. That is important. If we polled into our district, the gentleman from Montana (Mr. HILL) just was here telling me what he had done, that is what the American people want. They want us to pay down on that \$5.5 trillion debt that is a disgrace to this Nation.

Number two, preserving and protecting Social Security.

Number three, shrinking the growth of government by reducing spending by 1 percent over 5 years. That is not much, but let me tell my colleagues, it is a step in the right direction.

Finally, relieving the tax burden on families through elimination of the marriage penalty, and that may be the most important thing that we do here this year.

Mr. Speaker, this rule allows the House to choose between two distinct investigations of government. One is envisioned by the President and his tax-and-spend plan, which is largely characterized by the substitute offered by our colleague from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT). It follows the same vision of the President in the budget that he had presented to us.

If we favor increasing spending, and if we favor increasing government and oppose cutting taxes, then we ought to stand up here tonight and vote for the Spratt substitute. If we oppose allowing this Congress even the opportunity to provide a net tax cut for American families, then we should support the Spratt budget. But I do not think we ought to do that.

Mr. Speaker, there is another vision of the government before this House tonight, and that vision is captured in both the Kasich budget resolution and in the Neumann substitute, both of which are good budgets in my opinion.

Both of these budgets seek to make the Federal Government's budget smaller and the family budget larger. Both seek to fulfill our outstanding commitments in Social Security, in Medicare, and to our veterans and even to our children and our grandchildren by paying down the national debt and ensuring, and this may be the most important part of all, ensuring our national defense is the best state-of-the-art that we can give to men and women that serve in our uniforms today.

Both seek to take advantage of our Nation's positive fiscal climate by continuing the country's shift towards a smaller government, greater individual responsibility, and expanding entrepreneurship and economic initiative.

That is really what we ought to be here doing, because that creates jobs and it helps small business across this Nation, particularly small business that creates 75 percent of all the new jobs in America every single year, not only for those that are being displaced by downsizing but young men and women, girls and boys, coming out of high school and college.

Mr. Speaker, in closing I would just observe that the rule before us allows the House to openly debate two different visions of government, one Republican, and one Democrat, and boy, are they different, for a total of 5 hours of debate.

So I would urge my colleagues to support this rule. After the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY) has opened his statements, we want to get into a colloquy with the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH), the Committee on Budget chairman.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. SOLOMON), my colleague and my good friend, for yielding me the customary half hour; and I yield myself such time as I may use.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this rule and would like to voice my strong opposition to this Republican budget resolution. The Republican budget picks on those who are the most vulnerable in our society. The Republican budget will hurt low-wage working families. It will hurt the victims of crime. It will hurt the students. Mr. Speaker, once again it will hurt the veterans.

This Republican budget cuts Medicaid and children's health programs by \$12 billion over 5 years, in addition to the \$10.2 billion cut imposed by last year's budget. Republicans remove a guarantee of health care to families in need by block-granting the acute care portion of Medicaid.

Mr. Speaker, the cuts on those in need do not stop there. Republicans cut temporary assistance to needy families by \$10.1 billion. This is a change in their reported budget. They must be very ashamed of it because they submitted it only last night, in the dark of night, after the House was in recess.

The Republicans also cut educational opportunities for those in need. The Republicans cut Head Start and grants to school districts with high levels of poverty. The Republicans, listen, Mr. Speaker, the Republicans cut veterans' benefits by \$10 billion.

The Republicans also cut law enforcement. They refused to fully fund the Violent Crime Reduction Trust Fund. They eliminate the Legal Services Corporation.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York said he is proud of this Republican budget. I hope he is, but I am not. I would be willing to bet most Americans care far more about education and law enforcement and preserving a safety net for working families than they do about \$101 billion in tax cuts for corporate fat cats and the very rich.

I think my Republican colleagues agree with me, because as draconian as these cuts may sound, nearly every single one of them is set to go in effect in the future, like a budget cut time bomb. This could mean that the cuts will, God willing, never materialize; or it could mean that my Republican colleagues want to be as far away as possible when this blast finally goes off.

Mr. Speaker, the most surprising cuts are those in the areas that the House has spoken out loud and clear. The Republican budget cuts \$21.9 billion from the highway bill we just voted on 2 weeks ago. It cuts \$21.9 billion from that bill, the highway bill we just sent to the President. The Kasich budget would slice off \$21.9 billion.

The Republican budget will also impede the passage of any tobacco legislation. It will hurt our chances of fixing Social Security. It does not stay within the requirements of last year's balanced budget agreement either.

In contrast, Mr. Speaker, the Democratic alternative budget proposed by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) will reserve the Social Security surplus until Congress and the President can agree on how to save it. The Democratic alternative will enable Congress to pass the Patient's Bill of Rights and also the tobacco settlement. The Democratic alternative stays within the parameters of the balanced budget agreement.

The bipartisan budget proposal offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. MINGE) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) is also a far better choice than the Republican budget. It is nearly identical to Senator DOMENICI's budget proposal, which means it is very possible it could pass in both Houses, which is exactly why my Republican colleagues refuse to make it in order. Last night at the Committee on Rules it was said that the Minge budget should not be made in order because it is so close to the Senate position; it might pass. That would make that conference just too easy.

Mr. Speaker, the budget of the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. MINGE)

does not hurt Medicaid recipients or needy families or students or crime victims or veterans, and it might win more votes than the Republican budget. It is not surprising that the Republicans will not allow it to come to the floor for a vote.

This rule is a very unusual one, Mr. Speaker, in one respect. Until last year it was traditional for a rule on the budget resolution to guarantee that major alternatives would be considered. Special procedures called king of the hill, queen of the hill ensured that each of the substitutes would at least be debated and voted on. This rule just does not offer that traditional guarantee. If the first substitute is agreed to, the Democratic alternative cannot even be debated.

This rule will not allow Members to vote on the Minge-Stenholm budget. It does not guarantee that the Democratic alternative will be heard. It encourages Members to vote for a dangerous Republican budget.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose the rule.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, my hero, Ronald Reagan, used to say, "Well, you have heard it again. There they go again. There go those Democrats: Tax, tax, tax; spend, spend, spend." You just heard the greatest old New Deal speech that we ever heard on this floor.

What he is talking about is creating 85 new spending programs. Spend, spend, spend. Creating 39 new entitlement programs. Spend, spend, spend forever. Forever. Increasing spending by \$150 billion. Tax the taxpayers. Increase taxes and user fees by \$129 billion.

Mr. Speaker, we have a big difference between these two bills.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he might consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER) so that he can have a colloquy with the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH), the Committee on Budget chairman, and clear up some misunderstandings.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I was dismayed to learn that the committee-reported budget resolution before the body today does not reflect the additional Highway Trust Fund outlays guaranteed and firewalled in the conference report on TEA-21.

The TEA-21 conference report, which is about to be signed by the President, enacts into law firewalls within the discretionary spending caps. These firewalls guarantee that we will spend future Highway Trust Fund tax receipts on highway and transit infrastructure and not continue the past practice of setting spending from the trust fund without regard to the tax revenues being collected.

In drafting TEA-21, we worked closely with the Committee on the Budget and the administration to cut the cost of the bill substantially and to fully

offset the additional spending in TEA-21. Given that TEA-21 is fully offset, and the overwhelming vote of both bodies for the funding levels and the guarantees in TEA-21, I believe that the budget resolution should fully reflect the guaranteed spending levels in TEA-21.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask my good friend the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH), chairman of the Committee on the Budget: Is it the position of the chairman of the Committee on the Budget that any budget resolution conference report or any other measure that will be used to govern appropriations in budget actions this year will fully reflect the firewall funding guarantees in TEA-21?

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield to me, the committee-reported resolution was adopted prior to the conference agreement on TEA-21. As reported, this budget resolution assumed that the additional Highway Trust Fund spending could be accommodated if fully offset. It is my intention that the budget resolution conference report fully comply with the highway trust fund funding guarantees contained in the conference report on TEA-21.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Ohio. Based on those assurances, I urge my colleague to support both the rule and the budget.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH), chairman of the Committee on the Budget, I am just a little confused by that explanation. Can the gentleman tell me how he can accommodate that \$29 billion that he took out of the Highway Trust Fund?

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield to me, let me say to the gentleman from Boston, Massachusetts, my good friend, I am really kind of amazed to listen to his comments, because I think ranking member of the Committee on Rules knows that what we are asking the Federal Government to do is, instead of spending \$9.1 trillion over the next 5 years—

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have limited time. Would the gentleman just answer my question?

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, I am answering the gentleman's question. Instead of the Federal Government spending \$9.1 trillion with all these things you talk about, guess what? You are going to get to spend \$9 trillion. Do you know something else? The families in your district that are being penalized by the marriage penalty will be helped. We will be able to accommodate this highway bill.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I reclaim my time.

Mr. KASICH. In fact, we will be able to pass the resolution.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I reclaim my time. The gentleman does not want to answer the question.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. MINGE).

Mr. MINGE. Mr. Speaker, we are now 45 days and 45 nights late in action on a budget in this Congress. Why? It is not clear to this Member why this Congress has procrastinated and failed to live up to its responsibility to provide the Nation and the appropriations committees and the other institutions with guidance as to our budget policies for this fiscal year and the four fiscal years to follow.

□ 2145

Shame. After 3 years of Blue Dog Coalition budgets coming to the floor of this body, the Committee on Rules has refused to allow such a budget to be considered this week.

Why is that? Is it because a moderate, bipartisan budget was proposed? Is it because it is an updated version of the Domenici version adopted by the United States Senate? Is it because there is fear that a bipartisan budget that is brought to this floor would pass and would defeat the more partisan budgets that are coming from both sides of the aisle?

It is not clear to me, and I think it is truly unfortunate that this body does not have the opportunity to consider a budget similar to the Senate budget, a budget that passed overwhelmingly, a budget that represents a mainstream course in this country, a budget that is designed to put Social Security first, not to spend the budget surplus until we have fixed the financial problems of Social Security; to reserve that surplus, to make sure that we are careful in husbanding our resources and not embarking on numerous new programs, not taking the resources that are so badly needed to eliminate the deficit and spending those resources on other purposes.

We are deeply disappointed that this budget was repudiated by the Committee on Rules, that we have not had an opportunity to bring it to the floor. Shame, shame, shame.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, one of the reasons why we have a different vision in our party is because of the majority leader of this House. I yield such time as he might consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. RICHARD ARMEY) to explain that vision.

Mr. ARMEY. I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, a very good friend of mine, Thomas Soul, once wrote a book entitled "Conflict of Visions." It was a good book, and I would commend it to all of us.

But what we are doing here today with this rule is we are setting up an opportunity for this House of Representatives to consider alternative visions. Earlier this year the President of the United States submitted his recommendation, his budget recommendation, to Congress. In that recommendation he set forth what is his vision for America. The President's vision was presented in a budget that called for 85 new spending programs, that created 39 new entitlement programs, that in-

creased spending by \$150 billion, and increased taxes and user fees by \$130 billion.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH), the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Budget, and the members of the Committee on the Budget got together, and they all agreed that that was not the vision for America that they would recommend to this House.

In fact, they wrote a vision for America in which we see a contrasting view; that their vision says, let us reduce spending by \$100 billion, and let us reduce taxes by \$100 billion. Let us take one penny on the dollar out of an annual budget that is \$1.7 trillion. A 1 percent spending reduction will allow us to have sufficient tax reduction that we can correct some of the more disparaging things in our tax code.

Mr. Speaker, we all tell our children, our best advice, young man, our best advice, young lady, is for you to get married and settle down. Yet, in today's tax law, they are punished if they do that. The Kasich budget makes available to us through reduced spending an opportunity to eliminate that penalty for marriage, and to do other things that are beneficial to the lives of our children through tax reduction, and to give them also a smaller, more efficient, more effective, more responsive government.

The Committee on Rules has taken these visions under consideration and they have written a fair rule, a rule that says, let us have the contest, let us have the contest between these two contesting visions.

If I might close, Mr. Speaker, with this observation to my colleagues on the Republican side of the aisle, in particular, this is our vision. This is what we believe we want for our children, a budget that reflects the need in this Nation for a government that knows and respects the goodness of the American people, and has the decency to respect that goodness by restraining itself from its excesses, both in the manner in which it takes money out of the pockets of the American working man and woman, and the manner in which that money is spent.

The Kasich budget gives us an opportunity to set a new standard to spend the taxpayers' hard-earned dollar as minimally as necessary to get the greatest service possible per dollar for the people of this Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues, vote yes for this budget, vote yes for this rule. Reaffirm our vision for America.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. TANNER).

Mr. TANNER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today out of sadness. I do not make many partisan statements. I do not do one-minutes. By virtue of the Committee on Rules turning down an opportunity for this

House to talk about the Blue Dog budget, it reminds me of a saying that many may have heard, that the Republicans are more efficient than Democrats. They are. By the adoption of this rule, they have achieved the same level of arrogance in 4 years that it took the Democrats that they accused of it 40 years to achieve.

To deny us a budget debate on this floor that might pass because it has too much bipartisan support says to me that partisan politics is more important than doing something good for this country. I rise out of sadness because we are not permitted to debate the Blue Dog budget.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BOYD).

Mr. BOYD. I thank the gentleman very much, Mr. Speaker, for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I wanted to spend my minute talking about the transportation issue, but I think at least after the weak attempt to explain why the transportation package that we passed here 2 weeks ago is not included in this budget, we all understand how bad this budget rule is.

I would just tell the Speaker and my good friend, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY), the majority leader, that with the majority and with the power of the gavel comes a certain amount of responsibility. That responsibility is to bring to this body a budget which makes a lot of sense.

There is not a budget here presented today that I can vote for, because I believe that we ought to stick with the balanced budget agreement which we passed last year. We ought not to go off on a wild goose chase with a bunch of new spending programs, and we ought not to go off on a wild goose chase with a bunch of tax cuts. We owe \$5.5 trillion of debt in this Nation that we need to pay down. We need to take whatever dollars we have and preserve Social Security and pay down that debt.

I would ask Members to vote against this rule.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the recommended rule on this budget resolution for several reasons. First, this rule would pit the \$10.1 billion cut in Medicare against funding for income security programs such as public housing, disability assistance, and WIC nutrition programs. This proposed rule demands the cruel and callous task of choosing whether to cut vital Medicare programs for our elderly citizens, or programs to provide basic services to our poor.

The policy of pitting people who need critical social service programs against each other is unethical, particularly since we are now experiencing a boom of wealth in our Nation. It is our responsibility to assure that we provide a safety net for those who need it, rather than decide who should fall through it.

I also oppose this rule because it is extremely limiting to this vital discussion in which we are about to engage. The debate on the Federal budget is a discussion of our national priorities, and the fundamental principle of democracy really dictates that we all have an opportunity to participate in the lawmaking process.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, for those just tuning in, this might well be called "Trillions after 10," because as we approach the 10 o'clock in the evening hour here in Washington, we are beginning to consider how trillions of dollars, of taxpayers' dollars of the American people, are to be expended.

Why this manner of consideration? Because this Republican budget, taken up after a full day of dilly-dallying, like most of this Congress, this Republican budget is truly a national embarrassment. It rejects the whole spirit of bipartisanship that produced the first balanced budget in decades, and the largest Federal surplus in the history of this Nation as a result of a bipartisan spirit.

Instead of a bipartisan approach to trying to resolve our budget for the next few years, the approach we hear tonight is the same tired old rhetoric of tax and spend that had to be rejected in order to get us together in a bipartisan spirit for this budget.

We came in as members of the Committee on the Budget to consideration of this proposal in much like the circumstances we find ourselves in tonight, with a take-it-or-leave-it budget, that rejected at the outset the number one goal of budgeting this year, and that is to save Social Security, first and foremost.

We presented an amendment that suggested that every penny of this large surplus ought to be devoted to protecting and preserving the Social Security system. That approach was rejected. It is rejected in this embarrassing Republican midnight budget.

Secondly, we said, recognize that there are a lot of American families out there struggling to make a go of it. Give them a targeted tax cut to address their needs with reference to child care, and support public education for those families that are trying to help their children get through our public schools.

Instead, this Republican budget proposes to eliminate the only Federal program that provides direct assistance to our schools for economically disadvantaged children. It is an embarrassing budget that rejects the needs of America's families and the needs of this Congress to work together.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I just have to say, there they go again. I am one of these old-

timers. I keep records. Members can go up in my Committee on Rules office up there, and I keep a record on everybody who votes against our rules we bring down here. I just need Members to know that.

I also keep a record of how people vote on increasing spending and decreasing spending. I follow the National Taxpayers Union's rating. I cannot help but call attention to everyone here the fact that most of these speakers who are speaking are the same ones who are rated as the biggest spenders in the Congress by the National Taxpayers Union. Not only are they rated that way by the National Taxpayers Union, they are rated that way by me, because I keep track of them.

All last year when people like myself were offering cutting amendments to all of these appropriation bills, cut a little here, cut a little there, somehow to save a little, to tighten our belts, these same people that are standing up here talking were voting against all of those cuts. As a matter of fact, I have never seen them vote for one cut in spending.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from somewhere in California (Mr. DAVID DREIER), a real spending cutter.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, from somewhere in California, I thank my friend for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to think back to 3 years ago, when, at the second lecture right behind us, the President, in delivering his State of the Union message to an overwhelming bipartisan ovation, said the era of big government is over.

Then I am reminded of what he did here just this past January, when he unveiled his plan for \$150 billion of new spending programs, and it included, as I guess the gentleman from Ohio (Chairman KASICH) told us in the Committee on Rules last night, 85 new programs, 39 new entitlements, \$130 billion in new taxes.

□ 2200

And then I was struck with the fact that just a few weeks after that the new premiere of the People's Republic of China, Zhu Rongji, unveiled his plan to close down 14 government ministries and lay off 4 million bureaucrats. And as we debate this China-U.S. problem that we have got that the administration has quite possibly created, I wonder which government is headed in the right direction.

Thank God we are having this debate which is beginning to focus back onto the issue of individual initiative and responsibility and creating a climate where we will have Washington do better with less so that the American family will do better with more.

Now it seems to me that, as we look at this, one of the things that was very troubling to me, and I raised it last night when the ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget was in the Committee on Rules, was

this idea of saying that any time that we look at the prospect of cutting taxes it has to be offset with a tax increase. I am not a big fan of this paygo provision, because we found that since we were able to reduce the top rate on capital gains what happened? We have generated a tremendous surge in revenues to the Federal Treasury.

Mr. Speaker, 172 Democrats and Republicans joined with us in our quest to reduce that top rate on capital gains from 28 to 14 percent. We did not quite get there. But I am convinced that if we were to go even further we could generate another level of revenues to the Treasury.

I think that what we need to do is we need to have a cut in the payroll tax. 75 percent of the American people pay more in payroll taxes than they do in Federal income taxes. It seems to me that we are now at least starting to get back on the right track, countering what was said here at the State of the Union message earlier.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support of this rule, and I urge support of the Kasich budget that we will be moving forward with.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON).

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, as we discuss our budget, we are really discussing the priorities that the American people have for the utilization of its resources. And certainly any budget discussion should include a variety of alternatives. Indeed, the majority denied one alternative which perhaps could have met in a consensus of the Members of this House on both sides. It might not have been the one that I wanted, but still we needed a full discussion of it.

I also rise to say that the proposal that we have here in terms of the Kasich bill denies the bipartisan approach that we had when we had the balanced budget agreement of last year. This violates the principles of it. It violates the undergirding caps of it. It has a black hole. We do not even know how indeed we are going to finance the resources for paying for the transportation bill, which is the bill of authority. And we know there ought to be a fire wall between the trust fund and this bill. It has many inconsistencies that one would think one who would want to be prudent in the spending and caring for priorities would address.

For that reason, I urge that we reject this rule, because it is not only unfair but it is the wrong way to discuss the priorities which will utilize the resources of the American people, and it certainly is unfair for us now to undo what we did last year where we had a balanced budget that indeed was crafted with a bipartisan approach. I urge a "no" on this vote.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of the Chair how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SUNUNU). The gentleman from New

York (Mr. SOLOMON) has 13½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY) has 14 minutes remaining.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

(Mr. ANDREWS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY), the ranking member, for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, here we do go again. After 30 years of partisanship and 30 years of red ink, I thought we learned something in 1997. When the parties work together, they can balance the budget, and we should all be proud that we did that in 1997.

There is a proposal that would build on that tradition. It was put forward by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. MINGE) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM). It deserves a hearing on this floor. It is not perfect. It may not even win majority support. I would support it, as I intend to support the budget offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT), but it deserves a hearing because it builds a bridge between the two parties, and it builds a bridge between this House and the other body.

We should reject this rule because this rule rejects our right to fully and fairly debate all of the alternatives before the American people. Reject this rule. Give us a chance to debate all the alternatives.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. WELLER).

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Speaker, I stand in support of the rule, of course, which makes in order three alternative budgets tonight. Frankly, two of them seem to me pretty good ideas.

Both of them, one sponsored by the gentleman from Ohio (Chairman KASICH) and one by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. NEUMANN), they spend less, but they also make a number one priority elimination of the marriage tax penalty suffered by 42 million taxpayers. The Democratic proposal spends more, taxes more, and fails to address the marriage tax penalty suffered by 42 million taxpayers.

Let me explain why elimination of the marriage tax penalty is so very, very important to 42 million taxpayers. Think about it. Do Americans feel that it is fair that under our current Tax Code a married working couple pays more in taxes just because they are married? Do Americans feel that it is fair that 21 million married working couples pay \$1,400 more in higher taxes just because they are married than an identical couple with identical incomes that live together outside of marriage?

Americans back home in Chicago and the south suburbs feel that is wrong. Let me give an example of a south suburban couple in the suburbs of Chicago, Joliet, a machinist who works at Cat-

terpillar and a schoolteacher in the Joliet public schools. This Joliet Caterpillar machinist makes \$30,500 a year. If he is single, under our current Tax Code, after the standard deductions and exemptions, he is in the 15 percent tax bracket. If he meets and marries a gal who is a public schoolteacher with an identical income and they combine their incomes, under our Tax Code, if they file jointly, their combined income of \$61,000 after standard deductions and exemptions still makes them pay more taxes. Almost \$1,400 more they pay under our Tax Code today.

That is wrong that the average working married couple pays, on average, \$1,400 more just because they are married. And the Republican budgets eliminate the marriage tax penalty. Think about it. For this couple in Joliet, this machinist at Caterpillar, this public schoolteacher at the Joliet public schools, \$1,400 is real money. For some in Washington, \$1,400 is a drop in the bucket, but for this couple in Joliet \$1,400 is one year's tuition at the local community college at Joliet Junior College. \$1,400 is 3 months' day care in the local day care center. That is real money for this machinist and schoolteacher.

If we care for working families, let us eliminate the marriage tax penalty. Why? Because it is real money for real people. And I think like I know a lot of my friends do, and it should be a bipartisan concern. We should allow this machinist and this schoolteacher to keep more of what they earn. Is it fair that they pay a penalty because they are married? Of course not. Let us eliminate the marriage tax penalty.

There are three alternative budgets here. Even the one that was proposed that was not listed that everyone keeps referring to on the other side fails to address what should be our number one priority this year, that is eliminating the marriage tax penalty. I urge adoption of the rule and the elimination of the marriage tax penalty.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT), the ranking member of the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman who just spoke said that our resolution, the substitute which I am offering on behalf of the Democratic Caucus, makes no effort to mitigate the marital tax penalty, and that is not correct.

Section 11 says, it is the sense of the Congress that the Committee on Ways and Means should undertake high-priority tax relief of at least \$30 billion over 5 years and lists four things we would like to accomplish; and the fourth is mitigate the Tax Code marriage penalties in a manner at least equal in scope to the 1995 tax relief provision of H.R. 2491, which was a Republican bill.

We are endorsing that. Twice the gentleman from Washington (Mr. McDERMOTT), a member of the Committee on Ways and Means, has moved

a marital tax mitigation bill. Twice the majority on the committee have rejected it. Last year, he moved it in the Committee on the Budget, and they rejected it. We are calling for action this year in our resolution also.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) for letting us on the Democratic side of the aisle come forward and acknowledge that for a long time we have been fighting as well against the marriage penalty, and I appreciate the gentleman's clarification.

Mr. Speaker, we are here today because the budget resolution of last year was a bipartisan effort. But I will assure my colleagues that I am not going to support this rule or any part of this budget that cuts the entitlements of people who are in need of some \$56 billion. Entitlements including \$12 billion in Medicaid, \$10 billion in temporary assistance for needy families.

The proposed Republican plan would terminate all direct Federal assistance to public schools in our poorest areas, particularly repealing Title I grants. It is as well shocking that the Republican plan guts the discretionary education program by \$6 billion. We who claim to be in support of family values, we who claim to be in support of children, and yet we are cutting some \$28.7 million from the State of Texas Child Family Services. Child Care and Adult Protective Services will be reduced by \$8.89 million, and the Texas Workforce Commission will be cut by \$340,000.

Mr. Speaker, let me say this is a bad bill. I urge my colleagues to vote against the rule and vote against the budget as well.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to voice my concerns about H. Con. Res. 284, the House Budget Resolution. I strongly object to the Budget that has been proposed by the Republican leadership.

I believe that the hope and future of this country depends on its children, and this Budget Resolution does not provide our young people with the access to child care, health care and education that they deserve and need to become healthy and independent members of our workforce and communities.

The Republican plan misses every opportunity to make constructive investments in our future to improve our government's services and benefits for our citizens who need it most. The Republican plan cuts entitlement by \$56 billion dollars. Entitlements including \$12 Billion in Medicaid, \$10 Billion in Temporary Assistance for Needy Families!

This is a travesty! How can we say that we care about the health and welfare of our future, about our children's health when we remove poor children's access to crucial health care?

And what about our children's chances for education, for advancement, for their chance to be respected, learned and contributive

members of our communities? The Republicans themselves have criticized the plan. Senator DOMENICI in relation to the bill said "You just can't do this. This is just not a possible solution and we [in the Senate] would not do it because we couldn't live with it in the waning days of the session."

If the Republicans themselves say they cannot live with the bill, how can our most needy and most vulnerable populations live with such a plan? The answer is that our children, our inner city poor, our single parents, will suffer and unfairly, if this absurd Republican plan is passed.

The proposed Republican plan would terminate all direct federal assistance to public school districts in our poorest areas by repealing Title I grants. It is shocking that the Republican plan cuts the discretionary education program by \$6 billion below last year's Balanced Budget Agreement and \$7 billion below our Democratic plan.

It will eliminate Americorps and the Legal Services Corporation both which provide critical assistance to many of our poor citizens who need to secure housing, fair pay and a fair chance.

We must put the health and welfare of our people, our families, our communities first. The Republican plan would freeze WIC, and head start at 1998 funding levels for 5 years, as well as section 8 Housing causing at least a million households to lose federal vouchers and certificates by 2003.

In fact 14 percent of the Mandatory cuts come from low income programs, hitting those who need the funding the most. Our families who need food stamps for their basic nutritional needs, welfare to work and social service programs, will lose their tentative grip on self-sufficient independent living when all these are erased. Combined with the proposed \$12 billion worth of cuts in Medicaid/Children's Health Insurance Program, almost 49% of the Republican's mandatory cuts hit programs for the poor and near poor, even though these programs constitute only about one-fifth of all entitlements.

In the President's state of the Union address, he proposed initiatives in child care, health care and education, yet, the Republicans in Budget Committee voted to reject every single initiative, even the most inexpensive. We have a responsibility to provide for our nation's future—and all the people who need services to survive and to thrive.

In my home state of Texas, proposed cuts in the Social Services Block Grant will result in a loss to the State of Texas of approximately \$28.7 million. Child and Family Services, Child Care Regulation and Adult Protective Services will be reduced by \$8.89 million from the amount they currently receive, and the Texas Workforce Commission which receives 1.2% of the Texas allocation and supports child care for low income families will be cut by 17% or \$340,000. The Department of Human Services providing Family Violence and Community Care Services will lose 14.34 million dollars.

In Harris County where I live, poverty has increased 42%, and 240 thousand children are living in poverty, and 30,000 families are on the waiting list for child care assistance. Child abuse and neglect accounts for 20% of all children's homicides in the county, and only 42.7% of all the children who were abused in Harris County actually received any therapeutic services.

I urge my colleagues to think carefully when they cast their votes this evening on H. Con. Res. 284. It is critical that we consider fairness, and compassion in making their decisions. We must provide adequate resources to ensure our America, our children a strong and healthy future.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. RODRIGUEZ).

(Mr. RODRIGUEZ asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. Mr. Speaker, in this budget resolution, why are we asking our veterans to give up more than they have already sacrificed? We looked in terms of the recommendations that were being brought up, and it was brought in terms of a "new vision." It was presented as a "new vision."

Mr. Speaker, what kind of a new vision is it? I cannot even imagine cutting one of the following programs. This new vision eliminates the cost-of-living adjustments for education and service-connected veterans benefits. It eliminates the cost-of-living adjustments for low-income wartime veterans who receive a pension. It eliminates dependent benefits for veterans whose service-connected disabilities are rated at 30, 40, and 50 percent. It eliminates compensation for veterans with service-connected disabilities rated at 10 percent.

Is that the new vision that the majority is presenting? Is this the vision that goes after those individuals who have fought for our country? Again, even if such drastic benefits reductions have changed and continue to be made, we would still have met less than half of the savings required under the Budget Resolution.

The Committee on Veterans' Affairs has done its fair share through the era of downsizing and cutbacks. I find it profoundly unfair that at this time we come back and hit those individuals that have fought for our country. We are asking to cut \$10.4 billion total from veterans service.

At this time, I ask Members to vote against the rule and consider reassessing that warped vision that they have.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH), the hard-working member of the Committee on the Budget with his very impressive chart.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I am a farmer from Michigan and seems to me we need to get the budget hay out of the mow and down on that barn floor where we can chew on it a little bit.

This graph represents what has been happening to spending in this country. There has been a lot of complaints from liberals that would like to spend more, have government bigger and solve more problems in Washington. Of course that would mean increase taxes or increase borrowing.

This chart shows that, in 1994, we were spending about \$1.4 trillion. By

2003, the last year of this new 5-year budget, we are going to be spending \$1.9 trillion, over a 30 percent increase in spending. Spending even on this budget increases almost twice as fast as inflation.

In the final year of this budget, in the fifth year, 2003, we are spending about \$1.9 trillion. If we followed the President's and the Democrats' recommendations, we would be spending \$67 billion more in that 1 year alone.

□ 2215

The question before us is do we want bigger government or more efficient government? Do we want more taxes or fewer taxes? Do we want to continue borrowing or pay down debt? What has brought about economic vitality is the fact that government is borrowing less money.

Now, through these years shown on this chart, we are also going to experience the largest surplus in our history. In some of these years tax revenues are increasing four times the inflation rate. So if we want to help American families, if we want to stimulate the economy, if we want to make it easier for working families to spend more time with our children, we need to continue tax cuts. Let us also look at starting to pay down the debt of this government.

As we look back over past years, I think it is fair to say that some of us have been determined to reduce the size of this government, reduce taxes and try to make this huge bureaucracy more efficient. One way to make this government more efficient is to tighten the purse strings. If there is any operation in the United States that has opportunity to be more efficient and at the same time provide more and better services to the American people, it is the Federal government.

I hope that we all appreciate the fact that there are better and more efficient ways to spend taxpayers' moneys. There are better ways to serve the citizens of the United States. Even this budget that has been criticized for not spending enough, increases spending twice the rate of inflation. In the early 1990s, we had budgets that increased over 9 percent a year. This budget increase spending 2 to 3 to 4 percent a year. In conclusion, let us reduce the growth in spending, reduce taxes, and reduce the public debt and start saving Social Security. We can do that by supporting this rule and supporting this budget.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule and the budget resolution because again we are playing politics more than balancing budgets. Why, for example, did not the rule allow the Stenholm-Minge budget to be considered? The reason it did not was because it probably would have passed, because it is virtually identical to the Senate budget resolution. Instead we are on the path that

we were on in the 104th Congress that led to two government shutdowns. Why are we doing this again?

When you look at this budget resolution, you realize that this budget cannot pass, that we cannot reach agreement on its specifics nor its cumulative impact. For example, \$3.3 billion is cut from the Federal Employees Health Benefits Plan. CBO estimates that means Federal employees, instead of paying 28 percent for their health insurance which they do now, in 7 years will be paying 50 percent of their health insurance premiums. Last year we took \$5 billion away from Federal employees, and we said in return we are going to at least provide health insurance security, then this year we take it away from them. How are we going to provide the kind of quality professional Federal work force that we need when we cannot retain and recruit people, when we cannot even keep our promises?

Throughout this budget we have got the very kinds of things we encountered in the 104th Congress, things that are going to create problems throughout the rest of this term, things that are bound to create problems within our appropriations bills and are going to put us in the very same situation that caused us to shut down the government. We should not be on this path. We should be finding a way to reach agreement. The Stenholm-Minge budget resolution would have enabled us to do that. That is why it is not part of this rule. That is why we should oppose this rule. What we ought to be doing is trying to find reconciliation instead of trying to foment division.

When you look at what we do to dependent groups, whether it be veterans, whether it be Federal employees, whether it be people dependent on Medicare or the people that are affected by welfare reform, or children stuck in inferior education systems—all of them get hurt far more than our constituents would want. Vote against this budget rule and the budget resolution.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. RIVERS).

(Ms. RIVERS asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, during the budget hearing the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH) made an amazing statement. He said, "I know that most Americans, interestingly enough, do not believe that we are actually going to have a balanced budget. We are going to have a balanced budget, but they don't believe it. So not only don't they believe it is going to be balanced, they do not believe there is going to be a surplus."

Now I call that amazing, not because the public does not trust us, but because the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH) seemed surprised by the fact that the public does not trust us. Balancing the budget and the surplus

comes up in my district all the time. My constituents are not confused by the issue at all. They understand that the budget can be called balanced only when one includes the monies from the various trust funds, most notably Social Security. They also understand that when Social Security monies are removed from the mix, the surplus evaporates and the Federal budget is actually in deficit to the tune of nearly \$100 billion a year for the indefinite future.

The Blue Dog budget operates from the realities that I just mentioned. But this rule deprives the public of the opportunity to hear debate on that proposal. Why do not the folks at home trust us? Maybe it is because of decisions like that.

If the chairman is concerned about our credibility out there in the real world, he should reconsider this budget. Why? Well, first, it does not add up. You have heard about a \$5 billion hole that has not been fixed as this budget has proceeded. You have heard about double counting the cuts, and about sleight of hand which makes us pretend that decisions like the transportation bill and the food stamp decision earlier this evening do not really exist. It all ignores reality. And the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH) is surprised that the public does not trust us.

They have also said it is just 1 percent, anybody can take a 1 percent cut, which of course is meant to lead people into believing that all programs will share equally in the cuts. It is not true. Two-thirds of all the spending we do will not be part of these reductions.

Let us take a look at what will happen over the next five years, starting with before the balanced budget agreement started. We find a 21.2 percent cut in international affairs in the face of an increasingly perilous world, 30 percent in housing, 16 percent in regional and community development 2 percent in transportation, 12 percent, 1 percent. It is not so, and we wonder why people do not trust us.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH), my favorite play-by-play sportscaster.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from California for yielding me this time.

This is not a game nor an athletic event, nor an exercise in partisan politics. My friend from Michigan who preceded me in the well wondered aloud why people do not trust us. There is a fundamental reason for the cynicism, Mr. Speaker. The distrust comes because when we are given an historic opportunity to rein in the growth of government, not to radically cut spending but to rein it in and reduce its size, sadly we hear the familiar litany of fear and smear and that the sky is falling in and that there will be those who will bear the brunt of these cuts.

Mr. Speaker, I am serving my second term in this body, and one thing I know about a budget statement is that

it is a road map, a statement of principles that sets a goal. As we all know, we go through the appropriations process to decide how money is to be spent. So all the talk about all the cuts and all the fear is just talk.

Mr. Speaker, that is why a group who used to control this body no longer does. That is why the American people and my constituents in the 6th District say something very simple. For the last half century, they have been called on time and time again to sacrifice so that Washington could spend more. They tell me overwhelmingly and resoundingly, it is time for Washington to sacrifice so that working families can keep more.

That is the essence of the debate tonight, to restore trust in this process and to restore fiscal sanity and to maintain spending at more than the rate of inflation, certainly not draconian cuts. Reasonableness and common sense demand that we support the rule and support the budgetary process to offer this sensible road map to improve and to build upon what was done before, not to be locked into stagnation or into a revisionist history that would say that tax increases are laudable and desirable, not to continue with the mistaken notion that if we only spend more and if we only tax more and if we only ask more of the American people, then that is the key to nirvana or success. No, nothing could be further from the truth.

The fact is that the minority should stand with us and improve upon that historic agreement by stepping forward to say, let us live within reasonable limits, for those reasonable limits offer true compassion that working families understand and offer that restoration of trust so vital across this country.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI).

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman for yielding me the time.

I rise in opposition to the rule and to the budget resolution; in opposition to the rule because it deprives this body of the opportunity to debate other alternatives, for example, the Blue Dog budget.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that our budget should be a statement of our national values. But in the budget bill before us the priorities and values are seriously askew. This budget plan is cowardly and irresponsible. It is cowardly because it masks the deep cuts it would make in education, health and nutrition programs by providing few details about which programs will be downsized and defunded. This budget is irresponsible because it violates the carefully crafted budget agreement that everyone is paying homage to here tonight, but this budget violates that carefully crafted budget agreement which passed the Congress last year.

This budget today dedicated budget surpluses to untested private accounts for Social Security, when we should be

shoring up the long-term financial health of the entire Social Security system. By cutting Medicaid \$12 billion, we miss opportunities to expand health care access for children through the Children's Health Insurance Program. This is a very important investment for our country. The budget targets steep cuts on nondefense programs which are investments which pay off for us.

Once again, when some Members want to look like budget hawks, it is the family, the working families of America, the poor, the young and the old who are their prey. But the programs, the investments that we should be making in Medicare, Medicaid, the Earned Income Tax Credit, food stamps, education and many other vital initiatives would all be cut substantially.

Today we need a spending plan, an investment plan that protects Social Security, health and education, a budget that attends to our domestic strength and security as well as our international strength, and it must be done in a fiscally sound way. I urge my colleagues to oppose the rule and the budget resolution.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM), elder statesman of the Blue Dog Caucus.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SUNUNU). The gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) is recognized for 4 minutes.

(Mr. STENHOLM asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

□ 2230

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this rule because of its unfair treatment of the Blue Dog budget. We have heard a lot of rhetoric tonight about what is or is not in anybody's budget. Some of it has been true. Some of it has been stretching. The Blue Dog budget that we wanted to offer and have a chance for an honest and open debate on would have moved us toward a consensus by narrowing the differences in this body instead of dividing us as we are hearing tonight. The Blue Dogs tried to find a reasonable, realistic alternative to the budget resolution based on a simple philosophy. When you have a game plan that is working, you should stick with it.

Unlike the President's budget, we did not think it was wise to reopen the budget agreement for new, major spending initiatives. Unlike the majority's resolution, we did not think it was wise to call for another round of spending cuts until we have enacted the spending cuts we said we were going to do in the last year's balanced budget agreement.

We support tax cuts, including the abolition of the marriage penalty. And we agree with many of the initiatives in the President's budget. But we be-

lieve that staying the course on the budget agreement until we balance the budget, without relying on the Social Security trust fund, is a greater priority.

Our amendment would have saved 100 percent of the projected unified budget surplus for Social Security and recommend the unified budget surplus be reserved to fund the cost of Social Security reform legislation. Our budget reaffirmed the principle that budget discipline should be maintained until the budget is balanced without relying on the annual surplus in the Social Security trust fund. Our budget was based on the principle that the numbers in our budget should be honest and realistic. That is where our budget differs the most from the budget reported by the committee, especially with the changes in the manager's amendment.

Our budget incorporated the changes in the ISTEA bill, BESTEA bill and the agricultural research bill as estimated and paid for by CBO in order to provide a credible budget blueprint that reflects the realities of this body. We do not reopen Medicare, Medicaid, Federal retirement and other mandatory programs for additional reductions. We did not double count savings as the majority does tonight in the resolution they bring before us. We do not rely on unspecified spending cuts mainly backloaded until 4 or 5 years from now in order to pay for a tax cut up front.

Mr. SOLOMON, there you go again. I remember down the road that magic asterisk in David Stockman's budget that you and I both voted for and we are doing it again tonight with this resolution and I am not going to give credit to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH) for this because I know he is not for doing what the Speaker has ordered somebody to do.

We hear a lot of rhetoric around here about free speech. Well, free speech apparently does not apply to action on this House floor when it comes to having alternatives considered and an honest debate, an honest debate between a little different idea between the majority and the minority.

I do not understand what you fear. I fear that every dog in America is going to wake up tomorrow morning a Democrat. I hope he will. Because we are discriminating against dogs. The CATS got their amendment, the Conservative Action Team. They said, "You bet, come on the floor, debate your idea." But the Dogs, "No, you can't have your time on the floor." That is wrong. That is wrong.

We should defeat this rule. We should allow the Blue Dogs and others to have our opportunity to debate our idea in a free and open debate. This rule will shut down the Blue Dogs' opportunity to debate our idea. What are they afraid of? Why not let us have an opportunity to have our day in court.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, to close the debate on our side, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT) a member

of the Committee on the Budget who is neither a CAT nor a Dog.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SUNUNU). The gentleman from Minnesota is recognized for 4½ minutes.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from somewhere in California for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I was thinking about this debate, and what we have been doing for the last several months in talking about the budget. I was trying to figure out what I could say tonight and to my colleagues and to my constituents about this budget. But I was listening to the debate earlier. It was interesting because it almost seems like *deja vu*. Have we not been here before? Have we not had this debate before? With people saying, "You can't do that. You can't eliminate 300 programs. You can't balance the budget and provide tax relief. You can't reform welfare. You can't require able-bodied people to work." We did all of those things. And the budget is now balanced. We have come so far. Now they are saying, "Well, you can't reduce the rate of growth in Federal spending by 1 percent and eliminate the marriage penalty tax." They are saying, "You can't do that."

I was trying to think, how can we use some kind of a prop or some kind of an analogy to demonstrate what this debate is all about. Finally, I came upon it. I asked my staff to go out and see if they could not find a nine foot belt. We could not find a nine foot belt. What we found was three belts. We put them all together. It is nine feet long. Every foot of this belt represents \$1 trillion. That is how much the Federal Government is going to spend over the next 5 years, \$9 trillion. Anywhere you go, whether it is in Texas, whether it is in Ohio, in Minnesota, Michigan, wherever you go, I think everyone will agree that \$9 trillion is a lot of money.

What the Committee on the Budget has come up with is a fairly simple plan. They said if we could get the Federal Government, if we could get our colleagues on the Committee on Appropriations to simply tighten this belt one notch, one notch, we can eliminate that marriage penalty tax. As earlier the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. WELLER) said, this affects about 21 million couples and they pay a penalty of about \$1,400 per family. Everyone that spoke tonight has said that is wrong, it is bad tax policy, it is bad family policy, and frankly it is downright immoral that we require married couples to pay a higher tax than if they lived together without the benefit of marriage. And so all we are asking tonight is for our friends on the Committee on Appropriations, and if we work together on a bipartisan basis, I believe, and frankly I will guarantee you 98 percent of the people who might be watching this on C-SPAN will agree that we can get ourselves to tighten this nine foot belt simply one notch.

I know there are people on this side of the aisle, in fact, I think there may

even be some people on this side of the aisle who say, "You can't do that." But I will flat guarantee you that out in middle America, most Americans believe that you can tighten this belt one notch. That is all we are asking for.

I submit this rule is fair. We will have a thorough debate of three different alternatives. But in the end, Mr. Speaker, I will suggest to my colleagues that the Kasich budget, it is fair, it is reasonable, it is responsible, and frankly it is long overdue. I think we ought to approve the rule, we ought to vote for the Kasich budget and we ought to send a clear message to America that yes, we can tighten this nine foot belt simply one notch.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) has 30 seconds remaining.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, with that I would like to urge support of this rule.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 216, nays 197, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 205]

YEAS—216

Aderholt
Archer
Army
Bachus
Baker
Ballenger
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bereuter
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Brady (TX)
Bryant
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Coble
Coburn

Collins
Combest
Cook
Cooksey
Cox
Crane
Crapo
Cubin
Cunningham
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doolittle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
English
Ensign
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Foley
Forbes
Fossella
Fowler
Fox
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Galleghy
Gekas
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman

Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Graham
Granger
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heger
Hill
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jenkins
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kasich
Kelly
Kim
King (NY)
Kingston
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood

Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Livingston
LoBiondo
Lucas
Manzullo
McCollum
McCrery
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
Metcalf
Mica
Miller (FL)
Moran (KS)
Myrick
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oxley
Packard
Pappas
Parker
Paul

Paxon
Pease
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Redmond
Regula
Riggs
Riley
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Roukema
Royce
Ryun
Salmon
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer, Dan
Schaffer, Bob
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays

Shimkus
Shuster
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith, Linda
Snowbarger
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Stearns
Stump
Sununu
Talent
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thornberry
Thune
Tiahrt
Trafigant
Upton
Walsh
Wamp
Watkins
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Wicker
Wolf
Young (FL)

NAYS—197

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baesler
Baldacci
Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Bentsen
Berman
Berry
Bishop
Blagojevich
Blumenauer
Bonior
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Capps
Cardin
Carson
Castle
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Condit
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Cummings
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
Horn
DeLauro
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Edwards
Emerson
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Fazio
Filner
Ford
Frost
Ganske

Gejdenson
Gephardt
Goode
Gordon
Green
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hastings (FL)
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Holden
Hooley
Hoyer
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Jefferson
John
Johnson (WI)
Johnson, E. B.
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
Klecza
Klink
Kucinich
LaFalce
Lampson
Lantos
Lee
Levin
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manton
Markey
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McDermott
McGovern
McHale
McIntyre
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez

Millender-McDonald
Miller (CA)
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Nadler
Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascarelli
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Pickett
Pomeroy
Poshard
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Scott
Serrano
Sherman
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith, Adam
Snyder
Spratt
Stabenow
Stenholm
Stokes
Strickland
Stupak
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Thompson
Thurman
Tierney
Torres
Towns
Turner

Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Waters

Watt (NC)
Waxman
Wexler
Weygand

Wise
Woolsey
Wynn

NOT VOTING—20

Bateman
Conyers
Engel
Frank (MA)
Furse
Gonzalez
Harman

Hefley
Lewis (GA)
Martinez
McDade
Mollohan
Reyes
Ros-Lehtinen

Schumer
Smith (OR)
Stark
Whitfield
Yates
Young (AK)

□ 2257

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the resolution just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SUNUNU). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF THE SENATE AMENDMENTS TO H.R. 2709, IRAN MISSILE PROLIFERATION SANCTIONS ACT OF 1997

Mr. DREIER, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 105-566) on the resolution (H. Res. 457) providing for the consideration of the Senate amendments to the bill (H.R. 2709) to impose certain sanctions on foreign persons who transfer items contributing to Iran's efforts to acquire, develop, or produce ballistic missiles, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2183, BIPARTISAN CAMPAIGN INTEGRITY ACT OF 1997

Mr. DREIER, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 105-567) on the resolution (H. Res. 458) providing for further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2183) to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to reform the financing of campaigns for elections for Federal office, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

□ 2300

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 1999

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SUNUNU). Pursuant to House Resolu-

tion 455 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the concurrent resolution, H.Con. Res. 284.

□ 2300

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the concurrent resolution (H.Con. Res. 284) revising the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 1998, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 1999, and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2000, 2001, 2002, and 2003, with Mr. GILCHREST in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the concurrent resolution is considered as having been read the first time.

General debate shall not exceed 3 hours, with 2 hours confined to the congressional budget, equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on the Budget, and 1 hour on the subject of economic goals and policies, equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SAXTON) and the gentleman from California (Mr. STARK), or their designees.

The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH) and the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) each will control 1 hour of debate on the congressional budget.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH).

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I want to, first of all, begin by talking about the fact that last year we were as a Congress able to reach an historic agreement that is going to be able to achieve for the first time since we walked on the moon a balanced budget. We also anticipate that in the course of this year we will have a surplus. It will be generated primarily from the Social Security taxes as part of the budget. And next year, I am going to predict tonight, we will see a surplus in the general fund.

I think it was a significant accomplishment that we were able to move to do something we have not done since we landed on the moon, but, frankly, maybe I need to let you in open a little secret: Our effort here was really never just to balance the budget. Our effort here was really to transfer power, money and influence from this city back to where people live, in every community and every family in America.

Mr. Chairman, Teddy Roosevelt rode into this century with the idea that he should break the monopolies of the big corporations so that people could be set free to be successful. Well, I believe and the members of the Committee on the Budget believe that we ought to

ride into the next century and break the monopolies and trusts of the Federal Government so that people can be set free and that we can begin to run America from the bottom up, rather than from the top down.

Whether it is more choice for parents in education or whether it is to allow communities to set the rules and the standards in public housing and in job training or whether it is ultimately to set Americans free, to be able to invest payroll taxes, to be able to prepare for their retirement years, or whether it is beginning to break down that big money-raising machine called the Federal Tax Code that props up the monopolies of the Federal Government, our efforts are to make this city a lot less important, to make this city and government a lot more efficient and a lot more effective, and to make the budget of government a lot smaller and the budget of the family a heck of a lot bigger.

Now, we reached this historic agreement last year. This budget agreement, historic only from the standpoint we have not achieved this in over 30 years, we viewed that agreement as a ceiling on government; not a floor of the growth of government, but a ceiling on government. The President, however, and many of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, viewed the agreement last year as a floor on government and not a ceiling.

Now, can you imagine, with an American people, an American electorate that has very little confidence in the fact that we can get a balanced budget, that the President came up here to Capitol Hill and he announced a program that would increase fees and taxes by \$130 billion? Think about that. The President of the United States, who declared the era of big government over, within a period of 6 months after we signed an agreement and he declared the end of the era of big government, comes to the House, comes to the House and proposes \$130 billion worth of new tax increases. And that was not enough, because the tax increases were going to fund \$150 billion worth of new spending.

The President of the United States raises taxes by \$130 billion and raises spending by \$150 billion. He has 39 new entitlement programs. I hear so many of my friends talk about the need to control entitlement programs. He has 39 new ones.

I never heard a peep, never heard a peep out of the minority when Franklin Raines came up here to present this President's budget. In fact, the budget resolution that the Democrats offer will provide for bigger government, breaking the spending caps, and having a philosophy that "we like government."

At the same time that the President proposed \$150 billion in new spending and \$130 billion in new taxes and 39 new entitlement programs, we also developed 85 new spending schemes. This is the President that said the era of big